

**Minutes**  
**Cooperative Agreement Advisory Group**  
**August 13, 1999**

**Present:** Mike Riccardi (MG&E); Randy Nedrelo (Northern Engraving); Brian Borofka (WMC); Caryl Terrell (Sierra Club); Randy Kraemer (Kohler); Matt Redmann (Navistar); Karen Bender (for Walt Carey, Nestle'); Mike Gromacki (Cook Composites and Polymers); Terry Grosenheider (Dept. of Commerce); Lynda Wiese (DNR).

**Also Present:** Jon Heinrich, facilitator (DNR); Shelley Heilman, minute taker (DNR); Tim Mulholland presenter (DNR); Ed Wilusz, WPC; John Shenot, DNR; Steve Skavroneck, CBE; Troy Stucke, Kohler Co.; Pat Stevens, WMC; Kim McCutcheon, DNR; Lynn Persson, DNR; Kevin Lehner, ECSI; Buck Sweeny, MBF; Sarah Verhneger, Navistar; Jeff Smoller, DNR

**Absent:** Marilou Martin (EPA)

**The group, or specific members agreed to do the following tasks:**

**ALL: BY AUG 30, 1999, E-MAIL TO LYNDA WIESE ([wiesel@dnr.state.wi.us](mailto:wiesel@dnr.state.wi.us)).**

- **THINK ABOUT ANY ADDITIONAL GOALS.**
- **RANK THE GOALS USING THE QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE PRIORITIES FOR MEASURING REINVENTION?**
- **ADD COMMENTS TO EACH OF YOUR 4+ GOALS,**
- **PROVIDE POTENTIAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR YOUR 4+ GOALS. DO THE "SMART TEST"?**
- **RETURN THEM TO LYNDA WIESE.**

**ALL: IF YOU HAVE AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING -- GET THEM TO LYNDA WIESE.**

**ALL: REVIEW FOR ACCURACY THE ADVISORY GROUP LIST OF MEMBERS AND GET CHANGES TO LYNDA WIESE BY SEPTEMBER 30.**

**ALL: BY SEPTEMBER 15, 1999, LYNDA WIESE WILL E-MAIL A DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT TO THE ADVISORY GROUP. PLEASE PROVIDE FEEDBACK BY SEPTEMBER 30.**

**MIKE GROMAKI: BY AUGUST 30 PROVIDE LYNDA WIESE WITH ADDITIONAL DETAILS ON THE NEW GOAL, (MONITORING DNR/EPA RELATIONS) INCLUDING FREQUENCY AND METHOD.**

**CARYL TERRELL: WILL WRITE A LETTER TO LYNDA WIESE RE: CONCERNS WITH UNC DATA COLLECTION.**

**JON HEINRICH, FACILITATOR: BY THE NEXT MEETING WILL PROVIDE A SUGGESTED SET OF GROUND RULES INCLUDING HOW TO HANDLE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING THE MEETINGS, DECISION MAKING MODEL, MEETING LOCATIONS, GROUP COMMUNICATION AND MEETING CONDUCT ETC..**

**DNR: WILL SET-UP E-MAIL DISTRIBUTION LISTS, ONE FOR ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS AND ONE FOR INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS. THE INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS LIST WILL INCLUDE THE PREVIOUS ISO WORKGROUP MEMBERS AND OTHERS THAT ATTEND THE MEETINGS.**

**LYNDA WIESE: TELL/SHOW THE GROUP WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN DONE TO PUBLICIZE THE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PROGRAM AT THE NEXT MEETING. (WEB SITE, ETC.)**

**Next Meeting:  
Friday, October 15, 1999  
9:00 – 12:00  
LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED  
Madison**

**1. Introductions:**

- Advisory group members received packets with background info and handouts.
- All in attendance made introductions.

**Background:**

**Membership:** Membership of this 15 member advisory group includes one person from each pilot program, a representative from the Wisconsin Department of Commerce, Environmental Groups, EPA, DNR and Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce.

After discussion of community representation on the Advisory Group it was decided:

1. Membership remains as is, without a community representative.
2. After the second meeting, meeting locations may rotate around the state. The local community representatives will be encouraged to attend.
3. There will be an agenda item for open feedback from the local community representatives.
4. As part of the evaluation of the pilot program, DNR will gather feedback from all community representatives via a survey or other, mechanism.

-All meetings will be open to the public.

-Group will meet every other month (or as needed) for at least 3 years until the sunset date of the original legislation.

**Group Process:** Facilitator Jon Heinrich, DNR Bureau of Air Management, explained his role as making the group's process easier. He will help build agendas, make sure all members have an equal opportunity to participate, help identify the group's business and work effectively to address group tasks.

-Attendance at each meeting is important and expected. Send a substitute if you are unable to attend. Give Lynda Wiese the name and contact information of your substitute.

- Members are expected to bring calendars to each meeting so future meeting dates can easily be set.
- Communication within group will be handled via e-mail when ever possible.

## 2. Explanation of Group's purpose and roles:

In the original Environmental Cooperation Pilot Program legislation there was a provision to have a "Science Council" which would have evaluated how the initiatives affected public policy. Although this was deleted from the budget, DNR Secretary Meyer wants help from outside the Department to give advice, help design performance measures, provide input, etc. This Advisory Group will fulfill those needs.

**Tasks:** The group was given these original 4 tasks and was asked to brainstorm additional tasks:

1. Develop performance measures for the program as a whole (companies will be using the UNC data protocols). Determine how to define success. Monitor the workings of DNR and EPA under the Memorandum of Agreement.
2. How to make data on this program readily accessible.
3. Assist in preparation of annual reports to the Legislature (next due November 1, 1999) and in year four, a comprehensive report including ideas for next steps. (The 1999 report will not repeat much of the 1998 report. It will cover the MOA with EPA, the advisory group, an update on the pilot projects and future plans for measurement.)

Throughout the meeting the group identified these other tasks:

4. Combine data and information on the pilots with the Green Tier Program legislation.
6. Communication:
  - Keep all advisory group members knowledgeable of public hearings, etc. re: each pilot project.
  - Info sharing amongst pilots
  - Fast minutes, e-mails
  - Info sharing with regions so they are aware of program's prominence and to avoid miscommunication.
  - Use many tools in addition to the website to put this program "in front of their faces" – make it recognized, well known.

### **Other clarifying points:**

-Clarified that the group is not only going to evaluate the program by identifying what was a success and what was a failure, but also identifying what *we learned* and ways to improve.

-Clarified that this group does not monitor the Interagency Innovation Team (ITT). Also clarified that EPA region 5 will likely have standing members to help with consistency. DNR's members will vary because of the involvement of local permit teams.

-Clarified that with the new administration at EPA Region 5, DNR is not aware of any change in view re: this program. EPA in Washington D.C. is still tracking progress in Wisconsin and letting region take the lead.

-Clarified that the current draft agreements that are at EPA have many blanks because companies are not sure how to complete them. They are awaiting input

from EPA. Everyone acknowledged the importance of the agreements being up for discussion and not set in stone.

-Noted concern of companies re: available expertise of DNR staff since DNR's reorganization. Fear the longer standing EPA individuals may over power inexperienced, untrained DNR staff. Also fear inefficiency in that the company may need to play mentoring/tutorial role. DNR: whole department is in support of this program and while the expertise should be flexible enough to participate when needed, it is important for the ground level to be involved.

**Goals:** The statute provides 14 goals for the Environmental Cooperation Pilot Program. Lynda Wiese handed out an additional 4 goals from DNR. The Advisory Group will pick a subset of the goals to evaluate.

## **Goals of the Environmental Cooperation Pilot Program**

1. **Provide at least the same level of protection of public health and the environment as provided by current environmental law**
2. **Encourage facility owners and operators to systematically assess the direct and indirect pollution they cause**
3. **Encourage facility owners and operators to implement efficient and cost-effective pollution reduction strategies while complying with verifiable and enforceable pollution limits**
4. **Encourage facility owners to achieve superior environmental performance with regulated and unregulated environmental impacts, reduce use of natural resources, minimize transfers of pollution and minimize waste production while achieving a balance between the economic, social and environmental impacts**
5. **Recognize and reward facility owners and operators who demonstrate excellence and leadership in environmental stewardship or pollution prevention or innovation**
6. **Encourage information transfer about methods for improving environmental performance**
7. **Consolidate into a cooperative agreement requirements relating to a facility**
8. **Grant flexibility with regulations**
9. **Seek to reduce the time and money spent by government, owners and operators of facilities on paperwork and other administrative tasks that do not result in benefits to the environment**
10. **Encourage public participation and consensus among interested persons in the development of innovative environmental regulatory methods and in monitoring the environmental performance of projects under this section**
11. **Seek to improve the provision of information to the public on environmental and human health impacts of facilities on communities**
12. **Provide public access to information about performance evaluations conducted by participants in the program**
13. **Encourage facility owners and operators and communities to work together to reduce pollution to levels below the regulatory levels**
14. **Seek to increase trust among government, facility owners and operators and the public through open communication and support of early and credible resolution of conflicts over issues concerning the environment and regulations**

## **DNR Goals of Cooperative Agreement Process**

- 1) **Enhanced Environmental Protection**
- 2) **Increased use of Pollution Prevention**
- 3) **Simplification of the regulatory process**
- 4) **Improved government efficiency**
- 5) **Enhanced public involvement**
- 6) **Motivation for participants**
- 7) **Cost effectiveness**

During the meeting this goal was added:

Monitor the relationships between EPA, DNR (and Commerce?).

### **3. Performance Measures**

Tim Mulholland, DNR Bureau of Cooperative Environmental Assistance, gave an overview of performance measures and what the DNR is doing. He pointed out the value of doing performance measures and shared a SMART Chart to use when developing performance measures. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Limited)

-8/13/99 to 3/30/2000 = Develop performance measures

-4/1/2000 to 11/1/2000 = Gather data and prepare annual report for 11/1 distribution.

Areas identified so far to consider for performance measures:

- Each goal that receives priority ranking from the group.
- Performance Measures CEA Pilot Program Goal #3
  - Cost to business to stay in compliance
    - Cost changes for participants
    - Environmental changes for participants
    - Cost to DNR for participating in pilot project?
    - Cost to DNR for keeping a business in compliance.
  - P2 goes to the bottom line and we should show this balance.
- Measure of interest... by industry, others
  - as publicity increases, will interest increase?
- In measuring efficiency discussed quantity vs. quality.
- How is information disseminated in stakeholders group and community?
  - What does this yield?
  - How do perceptions change? Will opening business help or hinder?
  - How does this change in perceptions affect our business?
- Changes in perception of DNR/EPA and working with them in the future.
  - How to work cooperatively with less command and control.
- Should stake holder type goals be a priority since environmental/economics are part of UNC protocol?
- Suggestion to focus on those things outside an EMS measurement.
- Have the natural, social, and economic environments all been improved?
- Show there have been actual improvements to the environment and not just a shell game of transferring pollution from one medium to another.

Performance of each individual facility is taking place now and being reported to the University of North Carolina. Wisconsin is currently using UNC reporting

system because it seems good and was handy. Group questioned exactly what data UNC was collecting.

**4. Next Meeting and Future Tasks**

-Agenda suggestions so far: finalize ground rules, determine performance measures, clarification of what UNC data protocol contains, share info amongst pilots, and share information on publicity of the program that has taken place to date.